

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed August 31, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 13, 17, 19-22, 25, 27-32, 36, 39-40, 52-53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Susskind, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0046366 (hereinafter Susskind). Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind.

Claims 15-16, 18 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Paroz, U.S. Patent 6,587,125 (hereinafter Paroz).

Claims 24 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Cao, U.S. Patent 6,782,550 (hereinafter Cao).

Claims 26 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Venkatraman et al., U.S. Patent 5,956,487 (hereinafter Venkatraman).

II. Status of Claims

Pending are claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, and 55-56. Independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the present application.

III. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections of Independent Claims

The present application is directed to a system providing remote access and control of a media device (i.e. DVR) from different remote devices with Internet access. In one embodiment, an Application Programming Interface (“API”) is used to generate the interface between the DVR and different web portals (Specification, para. 16 & 162). The API enables a flexible approach across different types of network client devices to communicate with the DVRs. This flexibility includes generating integrated presentations in unique arrangements distinctive to the different types of web portals.

To further clarify the present application, Applicants have amended independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 to recite the use of an API to provide integrated presentations distinctive to the different remote devices. As these claim limitations are clearly described in at least paragraphs 16 and 162 of the present application, Applicants submit that no new matter has been added in light of these amendments.

A. Independent Claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are Allowable Over Susskind

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Susskind. Specifically, the Examiner cites Susskind for disclosing an HTML interface for accessing a DVR. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are allowable because Susskind fails to disclose using an API to form remote device specific integrated presentations.

The currently amended independent claims call for an API which forms one or more web-portal specific integrated presentations based on data extracted from digital video recorders (“receiving one or more integrated presentations formed by the API ..., each of the integrated presentations including the data extracted to replicate a corresponding interface of the digital video recorder”). The API then provides the one or more integrated presentations to the corresponding web portals (“wherein each of the one or more integrated presentations is distinctive to the web portal”). Susskind, however, only teaches a particular website URL for accessing a DVR.

As cited by the Examiner, Susskind shows a web access device browser 21 running a standard HTML Web browser pointed to a URL providing the interface components required to remotely operate the VRD 20 (Susskind, para. 35). As such, Susskind presents a particular website URL for communicating with a DVR via a remote control host server 24. Susskind does

not address other forms of web access such as Applicants' disclosed web "supersites" or websites hosted by unrelated entities and system administrators. (para. 91). This added flexibility of using other forms of web access is provided by Applicants' claimed API. As such, Susskind does not even recognize the problem addressed by Applicants' presently claimed invention, much less anticipate Applicants' solution. Because Susskind only discusses a single remote access URL interface, it does not provide the use of an API to interface different types of web access portals.

In light of the above, Susskind fails to anticipate "receiving one or more integrated presentations formed by the API ..., each of the integrated presentations including the data extracted to replicate a corresponding interface of the digital video recorder, wherein each of the one or more integrated presentations are distinctive to the web portal," as recited in the independent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 as amended are in condition for allowance.

IV. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections of Dependent Claims

Based on the discussions above, Applicants submit that independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants submit that each of the dependent claims 15-22, 24-26, 28-36, 38-41 and 56 are allowable for at least the reason it depends ultimately from an allowable claim.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the remarks above, each of the pending claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, 55 and 56 are allowable. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the current rejections. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2134 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2009

/George I. Lee/
George I. Lee
Reg. No. 39,269